REMARKS

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the present application in view of the foregoing amendments and in view of the reasons that follow.

Claims 15-20, 30-33 and 35-38 are currently being canceled (whereby Applicant reserves the right to prosecute these restricted claims in one or more divisional applications).

Claims 3, 5, 8, 10, 14, 21, 24-26, 34, 45, 47, 53 and 54 are currently being amended.

Claims 55-66 are currently being added.

This amendment amends, adds and cancels claims in this application. A detailed listing of all claims that are, or were, in the application, irrespective of whether the claims remain under examination in the application, is presented, with an appropriate defined status identifier.

After amending the claims as set forth above, claims 3-9, 12, 21-23, 44-46 and 50-66 are now pending for consideration. Please note that Applicant believes that "withdrawn" claims 47-49 should also be considered in this application, for the reasons explained below.

In the final Office Action, claims 46 and 50-52 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 112, first paragraph, for failing to comply with the written description requirement. Applicant believes that the amendments made to claims 46 and 50-52 in reply to the (entered) second Office Action have overcome this rejection.

In the final Office Action, claims 8, 12, 46 and 50-54 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. This rejection has been overcome by way of the amendments made in this response and in the previously-filed response.

In the final Office Action, claims 39, 41 and 42 were rejected as being obvious over 3M's Command Strip; claims 3 and 5-6 were rejected as being obvious over U.S. Patent No. 4,633,215 to Anders; claims 3, 4 and 7 were rejected as being obvious over the American Heritage Dictionary in view of U.S. Patents to Santa Cruz, Selga, and Leppert; claims 8, 9 and 21 were rejected as being obvious over U.S. Patents to Loeb, Omholt and Leppert; claim

23 was rejected as being obvious over U.S. Patents to Loeb, Omholt, Leppert, Santa Cruz and Selga; claims 3 and 5-6 were rejected as being obvious over U.S. Patent No. 5,165,549 to Hayduchok; and claims 12 and 44-46 were rejected as being obvious over U.S. Patents to Loeb, Omholt and Leppert. These rejections have been overcome for reasons set forth below.

Withdrawn Claims 47-49:

Independent claim 47 was amended, in response to the final Office Action, to recite an attachment device having an affixing element feature, which clearly corresponds to the elected Group 1, Species 2. The "third object" feature has been removed from claim 47, so that these claims clearly belong in the elected group and species..

Accordingly, claim 47, as well as dependent claims 48 and 49, should be examined in this application.

Objection to the Specification Re: Claims 46 and 50-52:

Claims 46 and 50-52 were amended in a previously-filed response to the final Office Action, thereby mooting the "new matter" objection raised in the final Office Action.

Section 112, First Paragraph Rejection of Claims 46 and 50-52:

Claim 46 was amended in the previously-filed response to the final Office Action, to thereby moot this rejection. As to claims 50-52, see the comments provided below with respect to those claims.

Section 112, Second Paragraph Rejection of Claims 8, 12, 42, 46, 50-54:

Claims 8 and 12 were amended in the previously-filed response to the final Office Action, to thereby moot this rejection. In the final Office Action, the Examiner asserted that "the preamble states that the affixing element is part of the first object, while the body of the claim states that the affixing element is part of the attachment device." Claim 8, as amended

in response to the final Office Action, recites the affixing element as part of the claimed attachment device. Accordingly, this rejection is believed to have been overcome by way of the amendments made in the (entered) response to the final Office Action.

In the final Office Action, claim 12 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 112, as being indefinite, due to the use of "bottom surface of the backer/stabilizer". In reply to the final Office Action, Applicant amended claim 12 to change "bottom surface" to "second surface." This features is clearly supported in the specification and the drawings; see Figure 20, for example. Accordingly, this rejection is believed to have been overcome by way of the amendments made in the (entered) response to the final Office Action.

Claim 42 was canceled, to thereby moot the rejection of that claim. Claim 46 was amended in the previously-filed response to the final Office Action, to thereby moot this rejection. In particular, the final Office Action asserted that the feature in which "the first and second ends of the affixing element are not visible when the attachment device is viewed by a viewer facing the first surface of the backer/stabilizer" was allegedly not described in the specification. While Applicant respectfully disagreed with this rejection, claim 46 was amended in the previously-filed response to the final Office Action, to recite that "the first and second ends [of the affixing element] are disposed against the first surface of the backer/stabilizer", which is a feature clearly supported by the drawings and by the specification.

With respect to claims 50-54, see the comments provided below.

Claims 50-54:

Claim 50 was not rejected over any art of record; rather, it was rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The final Office Action asserted that the "melting" process was not described in the specification. The final Office Action also asserted that claims 50-52 were indefinite under 35 U.S.C. Section 1112, second paragraph, and that the metes and bounds of claims 50-52 could not be determined. Applicant respectfully disagrees.

Claim 50 was amended in the previously-filed response to the final Office Action to overcome the enablement rejection of that claim. As described on page 6 of the specification,

"if the backer/stabilizer is made out of plastic, it can be heated, and a wire or other attachment device can be inserted into the heated plastic, to thereby rigidly couple the backer/stabilizer to the wire or other attachment device." Thus, claim 50 is clearly supported by the specification.

Additionally, in response to the comments made in page 3 of the final Office Action, it is submitted that one of ordinary skill in the art would readily understand that heating a plastic piece will cause the plastic piece to change its properties (e.g., melt), to thereby allow an affixing element, such as a metal wire, to be rigidly coupled to the plastic piece. Rigidly coupling means that the metal wire will stay attached to the plastic piece after such a heating operation is performed. Such a term is known to those skilled in the art.

To answer the Examiner's question posed in the final Office Action as to why one would want to melt the backer/stabilizer into a "blob of plastic", it is respectfully submitted that the backer/stabilizer will not necessarily be heated into a "blob of plastic", but that instead the heating of the backer/stabilizer is to provide a rigid coupling of the affixing element to the backer/stabilizer by heating the backer/stabilizer while placing the affixing element against the surface of the backer/stabilizer. This is clearly a desirable thing to do, since one does not have to find a way to couple the affixing element to the backer/stabilizer using a different way of attachment.

The features of claim 50 in which a plastic backer/stabilizer is heated in order to integrally form an affixing element, such as a metal wire, to the plastic backer/stabilizer, is very clear and certainly not indefinite.

The questions posed on page 5 of the final Office Action concerning how to do such things as recited in claims 50-52 are believed to be not pertinent, since it is not the particular temperature range of heating applied to a plastic component with a metal wire held against it that is important here, but rather that a method to rigidly couple an affixing element to a plastic backer/stabilizer is described sufficiently in these claims such that one skilled in the art would readily understand such an inventive feature. Also, claim 50 has been amended to remove the portion describing how the affixing element is integrally formed within the backer/stabilizer.

Accordingly, contrary to the assertion made in the Office Action, the metes and bounds of claim 50 are very clear, these claims fully comply with 35 U.S.C. Section 112, first and second paragraphs, and thus this claim should have been examined.

Claim 51 and 52 were not rejected over any art of record; rather, they were rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The final Office Action asserted that the "melting" process was not described in the specification. The final Office Action also asserted that claims 50-52 were indefinite under 35 U.S.C. Section 1112, second paragraph, and that the metes and bounds of claims 50-52 could not be determined. Applicant respectfully disagrees.

Claim 51 was amended in response to the final Office Action to overcome the enablement rejection of that claim. As described on page 6 of the specification, "if the backer/stabilizer is made out of plastic, it can be heated, and a wire or other attachment device can be inserted into the heated plastic, to thereby rigidly couple the backer/stabilizer to the wire or other attachment device." Thus, claim 51, and claim 52, which depends from claim 51, are clearly supported by the specification.

Additionally, in response to the comments made in page 3 of the final Office Action, it is submitted that one of ordinary skill in the art would readily understand that heating a plastic piece will cause the plastic piece to change its properties (e.g., melt), to thereby allow an affixing element, such as a metal wire, to be rigidly coupled to the plastic piece. Rigidly coupling means that the metal wire will stay attached to the plastic piece after such a heating operation is performed. Such a term is known to those skilled in the art.

To answer the Examiner's question posed in the final Office Action as to why one would want to melt the backer/stabilizer into a "blob of plastic", it is respectfully submitted that the backer/stabilizer will not necessarily be heated into a "blob of plastic", but that instead the heating of the backer/stabilizer is to provide a rigid coupling of the affixing element to the backer/stabilizer by heating the backer/stabilizer while placing the affixing element against the surface of the backer/stabilizer. This is clearly a desirable thing to do, since one does not have to find a way to couple the affixing element to the backer/stabilizer using a different way of attachment.

The features of claim 51 in which the metal wire is held against the plastic backer/stabilizer while it is being heated, in order to thereby form a composite structure with the metal wire being rigidly coupled to the backer/stabilizer (after the backer/stabilizer is allowed to cool), are also very clear and certainly not indefinite.

The questions posed on page 5 of the final Office Action concerning how to do such things as recited in claims 50-52 are believed to be not pertinent, since it is not the particular temperature range of heating applied to a plastic component with a metal wire held against it that is important here, but rather that a method to rigidly couple an affixing element to a plastic backer/stabilizer is described sufficiently in these claims such that one skilled in the art would readily understand such an inventive feature.

Accordingly, contrary to the assertion made in the Office Action, the metes and bounds of claims 51 and 52 are very clear, these claims fully comply with 35 U.S.C. Section 112, first and second paragraphs, and thus these claims should have been examined.

Claims 53 and 54 were not rejected over any art of record; rather, they were rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. The final Office Action asserted that the "a search of the prior art has not been performed for claims 53-54 because it is unclear what is being claimed."

Applicant submits that claims 53 and 54 are not indefinite, and that the metes and bounds of these claims are very clear. Claim 53 recites an affixing element having first and second ends, the affixing element configured to be affixed to the first object. See, for example, wire 410 shown in Figure 5 of the drawings, whereby the wire 410 is configured to be affixed to the ribbon 400 by way of a piece 510. See also the coupling of the wire 420 to the ribbon 40 as shown in Figure 4 of the drawings. Thus, this element is very clear, based on the specification and the drawings. Applicant is claiming an affixing element having first and second ends, and such features are very clear.

The final Office Action also asserted that it is unclear "what is meant by 'the backer/stabilizer including at least one opening for receiving one of the first and second ends of the affixing element so as to affix the first object to the backer/stabilizer when the first and second ends of the affixing element are coupled to each other." Please note that the

underlined text in the preceding sentence was removed from claim 53, in a previously-filed response to the final Office Action. Also, please note that Appellant is reciting a backer/stabilizer having at least one opening for receiving one of the first and second ends of the affixing element. The purpose of the opening, such as the openings 620A or 620B shown in Figure 6 of the drawings, is to receive one end of the affixing element (such as one end of the wire 420 shown in Figures 4 and 5 of the drawings), and whereby the end of the wire is fitted through the opening in the backer/stabilizer, which thereby allows the affixing element (with the first object affixed to it) to be coupled to the backer/stabilizer. See, for example, Figure 21 of the drawings, which shows two ends of a band 2110 that are respectively fitted through two openings of a backer/stabilizer 1710, with the two ends of the band 2110 coupled together at an other side of the backer/stabilizer 1710. Please note that this configuration is explicitly recited in dependent claim 54.

It is submitted that the features of the backer/stabilizer with at least one opening are very clear, based on the drawings and the specification.

As to the comment made in the final Office Action with regards to "how is the releasably attachable/deattachable [sic] unit" 'adapted' to be releasably deattached [sic]", the alleged "adapted to be" language was removed in the (entered) reply filed in response to the final Office Action.

Accordingly, claims 53 and 54 are not indefinite, and the metes and bounds of those claims are very clear such that they should have been examined.

Prior Art Rejections:

a) Claims 3, 4 and 7:

In the final Office Action, claim 3 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 4,633,215 to Anders. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 3 recites that the backer/stabilizer is a semi-rigid element. As described in the specification, a semi-rigid element may correspond to a plastic piece having a thickness like a

credit card. Such a component is not disclosed or suggested in Anders, which only describes rigid components to hold a HELP flag in place on a hood of a disable vehicle.

In the final Office Action, claim 3 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 103(a) as being unpatentable over the American Heritage Dictionary in view of Santa Cruz, Selga, and Leppert. This is the same rejection made in the previous Office Action. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The Office Action asserts that there exist well known methods of attaching Velcro that include a double-sided sticky foam tape that is analogous to Applicant's claimed backer/stabilizer.

This assertion is incorrect, since a double-sided sticky foam tape does not correspond in any way, shape or form to a backer/stabilizer described in the specification and recited in the claims. In more detail, the claimed backer/stabilizer is a semi-rigid element, as explained in paragraph [0066] of the specification. In this regard, the backer/stabilizer has a sufficient amount of rigidity in order to provide stability and backing to an object that is to be releasably attached to another object. A floppy foam adhesive tape clearly does not meet these features. For example, one can readily change the size and shape characteristics of a foam adhesive tape by rolling the foam adhesive tape on ones' fingertips. The claimed backer/stabilizer has a much more sturdier construction, and can only be bent or shaped differently with a reasonable amount of effort on the part of a user. For example, a backer/stabilizer may be implemented as a plastic "credit card size" component, as described on page 14 of the specification.

In the Response to Arguments section on page 11 of the final Office Action with respect to claim 7, the Examiner asserts that Appellant have not provided "evidence comparing the rigidity of the claimed materials with that of the foam tape of the prior art, therefore the argument is moot. Card stock, for instance, comes in different weights, the lightweight card stock being less sturdy than foam tape."

In reply to the Examiner's assertions made in the final Office Action, the claimed backer/stabilizer must be interpreted in light of how it is claimed and how that element is described in the specification. The claimed backer/stabilizer provides backing and stability

for an object, whereby that object may be a bow or a ribbon, for example. In that regard, the backer/stabilizer must have some amount of rigidity that is much more than an adhesive foam tape or a very thin card stock. To force Applicant to provide tangible evidence in that regard is just plain wrong, since Applicant is not a scientist and since the statements made by Applicant distinguishing the claimed backer/stabilizer are clearly evident to one skilled in the art.

Claim 3 was also rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,165,549 to Hayduchok. Claim 3 recites that the backer/stabilizer is a semi-rigid element, whereby Hayduchok only describes rigid components of his pocket container and stand for writing implements.

Accordingly, for at least the reasons provided above, claim 3 is patentable over the cited art of record, and thus dependent claims 4 and 7 are patentable due to their dependencies on base claim 3.

b) Claims 5 and 6:

Claim 5, which depends from claim 3, recites a connecting means that connects a first portion of a first object (e.g., a stem of a plastic flower) to the backer/stabilizer, wherein the connecting means is integrally formed as part of the backer/stabilizer.

Claim 6, which depends from claim 5, recites that the connecting means is one of a protruding region for coupling to a cavity portion of a first object (see Figures 22-25 of the drawings, for example).

Neither Anders nor Hayduchok discloses or suggests an integral formation of a connecting means to a backer/stabilizer. In Anders, the connecting portion 106A at the top of his base housing 106 does not appear to be integrally formed to the bottom of his base housing 106. In Hayduchok, his connecting portion 25a also does not appear to be integrally formed as part of his base portion 25.

c) Claims 8 and 9:

In the final Office Action, claim 8 was rejected as being obvious over U.S. Patent No. 2,424,762 to Loeb in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,993,783 to Omholt and U.S. Patent No. 5,123,139 to Leppert. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Loeb discloses a card (presumably fairly rigid) 11 that is used to hold a display element, such as a barrel bolt 10, as seen in the figures of Loeb. In Loeb, the wire 12 is twisted to form an endless circle (an endless elongated band of wire), and the looped ends fit through slots and are folded back to secure the lock to the display card 11.

Claim 8, however, recites that the first end of the affixing element is fitted through the first opening of the backer/stabilizer and the second end of the affixing element is fitted through the second opening of the backer/stabilizer, and that the first and second ends of the affixing element are coupled together to provide a coupling of the first object to the backer/stabilizer.

Thus, even if one assumes for argument sake that Loeb's card 11 corresponds to a backer/stabilizer (which Applicant submits is not the case, since Loeb's card 11 is not used to provide backing for or to stabilize Loeb's bolt 10, but rather it provides a means to display the bolt 10 in a department store, for instance), the ends of Loeb's wire 12 are coupled together at the front of the card 11, and thus the ends of the wire 12 do not pass through any openings on the card 11.

Loeb's way of adhering a wire 12 to a card 11 may cause the device being held in place on the card 11 to fall off the card 11 if the looped ends of the wire 12 (which are fitted through slots on the card 11) are not sturdy enough or long enough. The present invention according to claim 8, on the other hand, provides for a much more secure coupling of the affixing element to the backer/stabilizer.

In the Response to Arguments section on page 11 of the final Office Action, the Examiner states "Regardless of how many ends pass through an opening it remains that the product of the prior art includes a card (backer) with a wire passing therethrough, the ends of the wire being coupled together. Absent a showing of a patentable difference between the

prior art and that of the instant claims no patentable distinction is seen." Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner's statement. In any event, due to the fact that claim 8 recites first and second openings in the backer/stabilizer with a respective end of the affixing element being fitted through a respective opening of the backer/stabilizer and then tied together, the claimed structure is clearly much different than the structure of Loeb.

Furthermore, contrary to the statements made in the final Office Action, it is submitted that it is not necessary to submit evidence of the claimed coupling of an affixing element to a backer/stabilizer being better than the way a wire is coupled to a card in Loeb's device, since it is clear to one skilled in the art that the claimed coupling is better, and in any event the coupling of Loeb and the coupling as recited in claim 8 are very much different from each other.

Since Loeb does not meet all of the limitations of claim 8, and since none of the other cited art of record makes up for the above-mentioned deficiencies of Loeb, claim 8, as well as claim 9 that depends from claim 8, are patentable over the cited art of record.

d) Claims 21-23:

In the final Office Action, claims 21-23 were rejected as being obvious over U.S. Patent No. 2,424,762 to Loeb in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,993,783 to Omholt and U.S. Patent No. 5,123,139 to Leppert. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 21 recites a method for constructing an attachment device for attaching a first object to a second object, wherein the first step recites attaching a backer/stabilizer to the first object. In more detail, the claimed backer/stabilizer, as that term is defined in the specification, is preferably a semi-rigid element, as explained in paragraph [0066] of the specification. In this regard, the backer/stabilizer has a sufficient amount of rigidity in order to provide stability and backing to an object that is to be releasably attached to another object.

None of the art cited against claim 21 teaches or suggests such a backer/stabilizer.

Thus, since claims 22 and 23 depend from base claim 21, claims 21-23 are patentable.

e) Claim 12:

In the final Office Action, claim 12 was rejected over the combined teachings of Loeb, Omholt and Leppert, for the reasons set forth in the first Office Action.

The final Office Action asserts that "although the references are silent with respect to forming a channel portion on the bottom surface of the backer/stabilizer, . . ., it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to form channels on the back of the card so that the card was flush with the Velcro pad and consequently with the display surface of Omholt." The final Office Action also references U.S. Patent No. 3,751,769 to Reinder, Figure 11; and U.S. Patent No. 5,649,759 to Dion, Figures 1 and 2 numeral 30, for support for this position.

In reply, since Loeb ties the ends of his wire 13 on a front side of his card 11, and since that seems to work well for the purposes of Loeb's display card, it is submitted that one of ordinary skill in the art would not be motivated to utilize the structures of Dion and Reiner or to otherwise incorporate a channel portion in a back side of Loeb's card 11, since there is no motivation to do so. It appears that the Examiner is improperly applying hindsight reconstruction of the claimed invention with respect to claim 12.

The channel portion as recited claim 12 is a very useful feature, in that it serves two purposes. One purpose is to keep the tied ends of the affixing element hidden from view, and the second purpose is to help maintain the tied ends of the affixing element (and therefore the affixing element itself) in place between the backer/stabilizer and an attachable/reattachable unit.

In claim 12, the tied ends of the affixing element are provided in a channel between a backer/stabilizer (with its channel) and another component. In Reiner and Dion, on the contrary, a band is provided between symmetrical top and bottom halves of a same element, and thus it is submitted that the assertions made in the Office Action and the disclosures of Reiner and Dion are not pertinent to the invention recited in claim 12.

Again, since the tied ends of Loeb's wire are provided on a front side of his display card, it is submitted that one of ordinary skill in the art would not be motivated to provide

channels on the back side of his display card for the portions of his wire that fit through the openings in his display card, without prior knowledge of the present invention. There is no disclosure or suggestion in either Loeb or Omholt of there being a problem with having a wire disposed between one component and another component, to thereby require a channel to provide a smooth coupling of those two components. In Reiner and Dion, the channel is utilized to fit an elastic band between top and bottom parts of a same component, and thus these references are not pertinent to the claimed invention.

Thus, claim 12, is patentable for this additional reason, beyond those given above with respect to its base claim 8.

f) Claim 44

Claim 44 was rejected in the final Office Action over the combined teachings of Loeb, Omholt and Leppert, for the reasons set forth in the first Office Action. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 44 recites that the first and second ends of the affixing element are coupled together in a region between the second surface of the backer/stabilizer and the back side of the first releasably attachable unit. See Figures 20 and 21 of the drawings, for example.

The final Office Action asserts that, absent a showing of criticality with respect to where the coupled ends are located, such a requirement does not provide patentable distinction over the prior art. Like claim 12, the final Office Action references the Reiner and Dion references to show a recess.

In Reiner and Dion, contrary to the recitations in claim 44, a band is provided between symmetrical top and bottom halves of a same element, and thus it is submitted that the assertions made in the Office Action and the disclosures of Reiner and Dion are not pertinent to the invention recited in claim 44.

Again, as discussed above with respect to claim 12, since the tied ends of Loeb's wire are provided on a front side of his display card, it is submitted that one of ordinary skill in the art would not be motivated to provide channels on the back side of his display card for the portions of his wire that fit through the openings in his display card, without prior knowledge of the present invention. There is no disclosure or suggestion in either Loeb or Omholt of there being a problem with having a wire disposed between one component and another

component, to thereby require a channel to provide a smooth coupling of those two components. In Reiner and Dion, the channel is utilized to fit an elastic band between top and bottom parts of a same component, and thus these references are not pertinent to the claimed invention.

Thus, claim 44 is patentable for this additional reason, beyond those given above with respect to its base claim 8.

g) Claim 45

Claim 45, which depends from claim 44, was rejected in the final Office Action over the combined teachings of Loeb, Omholt and Leppert, for the reasons set forth in the first Office Action. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 45 recites that "the first and second ends [of the affixing element] are coupled together and fitted within the channel portion on the second surface of the backer/stabilizer."

No such coupling of first and second ends to be fitted within a channel portion is disclosed or suggested in any of the cited art of record.

The fitting of the first and second ends within the channel portion is a very useful feature, in that it serves two purposes. One purpose is to keep the tied ends of the affixing element hidden from view, and the second purpose is to help maintain the tied ends of the affixing element (and therefore the affixing element itself) in place between the backer/stabilizer and an attachable/reattachable unit.

Thus, claim 45 is patentable for this additional reason, beyond those given above with respect to its intervening claim 44 and its base claim 8.

h) Claim 46

Claim 46, which depends from claim 44, was rejected in the final Office Action over the combined teachings of Loeb, Omholt and Leppert, for the reasons set forth in the first Office Action. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 45 recites that the first and second ends of the affixing element are disposed against the first surface of the backer/stabilizer. Such a disposition can be seen in Figure 21 of the drawings, for example, between elements 1710 and 320. Such features are not disclosed, taught or suggested by any of the cited art of record.

Thus, claim 46 is patentable for this additional reason, beyond those given above with respect to its intervening claim 44 and its base claim 8.

New Claims:

New claims 55-66 have been added to recite additional features of the present invention (and the elected species), that are not believed to be disclosed, taught or suggested by the cited art of record. With respect to claim 55, none of the cited art of record teaches of suggests a combination of backer/stabilizer that provides backing and stability for a first object, a releasable attachment unit, and an affixing element, wherein the affixing element affixes the first object to the backer/stabilizer. With respect to claims 56 and 57, which recites features seen best in Figures 22-24, none of the cited art of record teaches or suggests such an integral formation and same material composition of the affixing element and the backer/stabilizer. With respect to claim 58, that claim recites features seen best in Figure 24, whereby none of the cited art of record teaches or suggests such features. With respect to claim 59, that claim recites features seen best in Figure 23, whereby none of the cited art of record teaches or suggests such features. With respect to claim 60, none of the cited art of record teaches or suggests the tab portions recited in that claim. With respect to claim 61, none of the cited art of record teaches or suggests the disposition of a connecting element with respect to openings of a backer/stabilizer. With respect to claims 62 and 63, none of the cited art of record teaches or suggests such first and second objects that correspond to an ornamental ribbon/bow or gift wrap, respectively. With respect to claim 64, that claim recites "slot" features of the backer/stabilizer that are shown, for example, in Figures 17, 18 and 19 of the drawings, whereby no such structure is disclosed or suggested by the cited art of record. Claim 65 recites a peel-off protective cover that cover an adhesive second surface of the releasable attachment unit. Claim 66 recites a channel portion of a backer/stabilizer, for holding the ends of an affixing element therein.

Accordingly, this application is believed to be in condition for allowance.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required regarding this application under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16-1.17, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. Should no proper payment be enclosed herewith, as by a check being in the wrong amount, unsigned, post-dated, otherwise improper or informal or even entirely missing, the Commissioner is authorized to charge the unpaid amount to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. If any extensions of time are needed for timely acceptance of papers submitted herewith, applicant hereby petitions for such extension under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 and authorizes payment of any such extensions fees to Deposit Account No. 19-0741.

Respectfully submitted,

Date March 11, 2004

By Phillip J. Articola

FOLEY & LARDNER
Customer Number: 22428
22428
22428
PATENT TRADEMARK OFFICE
Telephone: (202) 672-5300
Facsimile: (202) 672-5399

Phillip J. Articola
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 38,819